

Remarks

Claims 21-23, 26-28, 31 and 34-37 are pending. Claims 24-25, 29-30, 32 and 33 are canceled and new Claims 36-37 are added in this Response.

Claim Amendments Distinguishing Crawford and Nagel

Claims 21-24 and 26-35 were rejected under Section 102 as being anticipated by Crawford (GB2331820). Claim 25 was rejected under Section 103 as being obvious over Crawford in view of Nagel (20050038756). The claims have been amended to recite new elements and limitations not found in Crawford or Nagel.

Claim 21 has been amended to recite the printer displaying a plurality of pending secured print jobs each having an authorized bio signature associated therewith and the printer receiving a selection of one of the secured print jobs for printing. The selected print job is only printed if an entered bio signature matches the authorized bio signature for the selected print job. Support for the amendments to Claim 21 is found in Fig. 4 and the accompanying text at pages 12-13 of the Specification. Neither Crawford nor Nagel (nor the previously cited Davis 5633932) teach or suggest the printer displaying plural pending secured print jobs or the printer receiving a selection of one of the secured print jobs for printing, and then printing the selected print job only if an entered bio signature matches the authorized bio signature for the selected print job.

Claim 27 has been amended to recite (1) a first biometric identification device operatively connected to a computer configured to associate an authorized bio signature entered through the first biometric identification device with a secured print job and (2) a second biometric identification device operatively connected to a printer configured to compare a bio signature of a user entered through the second biometric identification device to an authorized bio signature associated with a secured print job received from the computer. The print job is printed only if the entered bio signature matches the authorized bio signature. Support for the amendments to Claim 27 is found in Fig. 1 and the accompanying text at pages 8-9 of the Specification. Neither Crawford nor Nagel (nor the previously cited Davis 5633932) teach or suggest two different biometric identification devices – one

Response to Office Action
Serial No. 09/776,057
Atty. Docket No. 10002445-1

-5-

connected to the host computer and one connected to the printer – to secure printing the print job as claimed.

New Claim 36 recites a computer associating a plurality of authorized bio signatures with a single print job, the computer sending the print job to a printer, the printer comparing an entered bio signature for a user to the authorized bio signatures for the print job, and the printer printing the print job only if the entered bio signature matches one of the authorized bio signatures. Support for new Claim 36 is found in Fig. 3 and the accompanying text at pages 11-12 of the Specification. Neither Crawford nor Nagel (nor the previously cited Davis 5633932) teach or suggest associating a plurality of authorized bio signatures with a single print job and printing the print job only if a bio signature entered at the printer matches one of the authorized bio signatures.

The foregoing is believed to be a complete response to the pending Office Action.

Respectfully submitted,
/Steven R. Ormiston/
Steven R. Ormiston
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 35,974
208.433.1991 x204

Response to Office Action
Serial No. 09/776,057
Atty. Docket No. 10002445-1

-6-